

## **REMARKS**

Claims 13, 36, and 59 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 13-23, 36-46, and 59-96 are pending.

The Office Action states that the information disclosure statement filed 4/7/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2). A replacement copy of each cited document is included, and is believed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2).

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 36, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema in view of Stedman.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 13, on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner acknowledges that “Huitema did not specifically teach to omit from the operating system at least one software component that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality,” but asserts that Stedman taught customizing the operating system by installing only selected components. Stedman describes removing application programs that run on top of the operating system and are “included with” but not part of the operating system. (Stedman, col.4, lines 24-31). Stedman does not describe “omitting from the operating system kernel at least one operating system kernel component that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality,” as recited in claim 13 as amended. Support for the amendment to claim 13 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 9, lines 3-18. As such, claim 13 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 13 is believed to be allowable for the additional reason that neither Huitema nor Stedman describes “a processor configured to run an operating system that is optimized to provide a network name-related functionality.” Huitema describes a domain name service (DNS) system (page 1, lines 28-33), but does not describe an operating system that is optimized to provide a network name-related functionality.

Claims 14-23 and 70-78 depend from claim 13 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 13, claims 36 and 59 recite a processor "configured to run an operating system that is optimized to provide the network name-related functionality, including by omitting from the operating system kernel at least one operating system kernel component that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality." As such, claims 36 and 59 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 37-46 and 79-87 depend from claim 36 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 60-69 and 88-96 depend from claim 59 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-9-2006

Clover Huang  
Clover Huang  
Registration No. 55,285  
V 408-973-2594  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014